STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

A telephonic interview was conducted between Examiner Hung Q. Pham and the Applicant's undersigned representative on September 27, 2005. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that amending independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of claims 5 and 18¹ would result in withdrawal of the current rejection. Consequently, Applicant submits this amendment.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 1, 2005 and the Advisory Action of September 12, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 are now pending in the present application.

Pursuant to the telephonic discussion between Examiner Pham and the Applicant's undersigned representative, Applicant now amends claim 1 to include the subject matter of claims 5 and 6. Claims 5 and 6 have consequently been canceled. Independent claim 7 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 11 and 12, which is similar to claims 5 and 6,

¹ It appears that the Examiner meant claim 6 instead of claim 18. Claim 6 includes subject matter similar to claim 18, but is dependent upon claim 1.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No. 09/399,696

Attorney Docket No. A8010

respectively. Claims 11 and 12 have consequently been canceled. Claim 13 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 17 and 18, which is similar to claims 5 and 6, respectively. Claims 17 and 18 have consequently been canceled. Therefore, Applicant requests that the current rejection be withdrawn.

The amendments to the claims were made to expedite the prosecution for the application, therefore, Applicant does not concede that the rejected independent claims are not patentable in view of the cited art. Further, Applicant reserves rights to prosecute the rejected claims in a continuing application if desired.

Each of the pending independent claims (claims 1, 7 and 13) stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ito in view of Arnold. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Ito/Arnold combination and further in view of Guedalia. The remaining claims stand rejected as being unpatentable over the Ito/Arnold combination in view of further tertiary references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over the applied references because the references above or in combination do not include "wherein upon receiving a request to add an additional RMI server, connecting the additional RMI server to an existing RMI server in the server hierarchy based on a number of connections of the existing RMI server" and "wherein upon receiving a request to delete an existing RMI server in the hierarchy, deleting that RMI server", as the Examiner agreed in the interview of September 27, 2005.

-7-

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No. 09/399,696

Attorney Docket No. A8010

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 3, 2005

-8-